

## REMARKS

### I. INTRODUCTION

In response to the Office Action dated August 20, 2007, the claims have not been amended. Claims 1-30 remain in the application. Re-consideration of the application is requested.

### II. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is Autodesk, Inc., the assignee of the present application.

### III. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences for the above-referenced patent application.

### IV. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-30 are pending.

Claims 1-30 stand rejected.

Applicants request reconsideration of all of the rejections.

### V. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The claims have not been amended herein.

### VI. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

The claim limitations and their support in the specification are set forth below:

Claim Limitation	Support in Specification
1. A computer-implemented method for defining a project in a computer graphics program comprising:	Page 6, lines 20-21; Page 17, lines 6-7; Fig. 6
(a) obtaining a project file in the computer graphics program comprising general information regarding the project;	Page 7, lines 10-12; Page 11, lines 7-9; Page 17, lines 8-9; Fig. 6 – 600.
(b) creating a directory structure in the computer graphics program for the project	Page 11, lines 3-4; Page 11, lines 20-22; Page 12, lines 1-2; Fig. 5; Fig. 6 – 602

wherein:	
(i) one or more project drawing files are organized into various folders by drawing file type of the one or more project drawing files;	Page 5, lines 10-13; Page 7, lines 12-16; Page 11, lines 14-20; Page 12, lines 3-4; Page 17, lines 13-18; FIG. 6 – 602
(ii) the one or more project drawing files are composed of either a building information model for the project or a report generated from the building information model; and	Page 10, lines 1-3; FIG. 4A – 402 and 404;
(iii) the one or more project drawing files are organized into the various folders based on the building information model or the report accordingly;	Page 10, lines 1-8; Page 11, lines 3-4; Page 11, lines 14-22; Page 17, lines 13-18; FIG. 6 – 602
(c) obtaining a companion file for each project drawing file, wherein each companion file provides information used to create the directory structure and comprises information to link each project drawing file to the project based on the building information model or the report; and	Page 5, lines 11-13; Page 7, lines 13-16; Page 11, lines 16-18; Page 18, lines 4-9; FIG. 6 – 604;  Page 11, lines 3-4; Page 11, lines 20-22; Page 12, lines 1-2; Fig. 5; Fig. 6 – 602; Fig. 4C – 406B, 408B, 410B, and 412B
(d) displaying, in the computer graphics program on a display device, the one or more project drawing files in the various folders.	Page 8, lines 3-10; Fig. 1 – 102; Page 9, lines 2-3; Page 16, lines 15-23;
11. An apparatus for defining a project in a computer graphics program comprising:	Page 2, line 14; Page 6, lines 20-21; Page 17, lines 6-7; Fig. 6
(a) a computer having a memory;	Page 7, lines 20-22; Fig. 1 – 100 and 104

(b) an application executing on the computer, wherein the application is configured to:	Page 8, lines 3-10; Fig. 1 – 108
(i) obtain a project file comprising general information regarding the project;	Page 7, lines 10-12; Page 11, lines 7-9; Page 17, lines 8-9; Fig. 6 – 600.
(ii) create a directory structure for the project wherein:	Page 11, lines 3-4; Page 11, lines 20-22; Page 12, lines 1-2; Fig. 5; Fig. 6 – 602
(1) one or more project drawing files are organized into various folders by drawing file type of the one or more project drawing files;	Page 5, lines 10-13; Page 7, lines 12-16; Page 11, lines 14-20; Page 12, lines 3-4; Page 17, lines 13-18; FIG. 6 – 602
(2) the one or more project drawing files are composed of either a building information model for the project or a report generated from the building information model; and	Page 10, lines 1-3; FIG. 4A – 402 and 404;
(3) the one or more project drawing files are organized into the various folders based on the building information model or the report accordingly;	Page 10, lines 1-8; Page 11, lines 3-4; Page 11, lines 14-22; Page 17, lines 13-18; FIG. 6 – 602
(iii) obtain a companion file for each project drawing file, wherein each companion file provides information used to create the directory structure and comprises information to	Page 5, lines 11-13; Page 7, lines 13-16; Page 11, lines 16-18; Page 18, lines 4-9; FIG. 6 – 604;  Page 11, lines 3-4; Page 11, lines 20-22; Page 12, lines 1-2; Fig. 5; Fig. 6 – 602; Fig. 4C – 406B,

link each project drawing file to the project based on the building information model or the report; and	408B, 410B, and 412B
(iv) display, on a display device, the one or more project drawing files in the various folders.	Page 8, lines 3-10; Fig. 1 – 102; Page 9, lines 2-3; Page 16, lines 15-23;
21. An article of manufacture comprising a program storage medium readable by a computer and embodying one or more instructions executable by the computer to perform a method for defining a project in a computer graphics program, the method comprising:	Page 2, line 14; Page 26, lines 20-23; Page 6, lines 20-21; Page 17, lines 6-7; Fig. 6
(a) obtaining a project file comprising general information regarding the project;	Page 7, lines 10-12; Page 11, lines 7-9; Page 17, lines 8-9; Fig. 6 – 600.
(b) creating a directory structure for the project wherein:	Page 11, lines 3-4; Page 11, lines 20-22; Page 12, lines 1-2; Fig. 5; Fig. 6 – 602
(i) one or more project drawing files are organized into various folders by drawing file type of the one or more project drawing files;	Page 5, lines 10-13; Page 7, lines 12-16; Page 11, lines 14-20; Page 12, lines 3-4; Page 17, lines 13-18; FIG. 6 – 602
(ii) the one or more project drawing files are composed of either a building information model for the project or a report generated from the building information model; and	Page 10, lines 1-3; FIG. 4A – 402 and 404;
(iii) the one or more project drawing files are organized into the	Page 10, lines 1-8; Page 11, lines 3-4; Page 11, lines 14-22; Page 17, lines 13-18; FIG. 6 – 602

various folders based on the building information model or the report accordingly;	
(c) obtaining a companion file for each project drawing file, wherein each companion file provides information used to create the directory structure and comprises information to link each project drawing file to the project based on the building information model or the report; and	Page 5, lines 11-13; Page 7, lines 13-16; Page 11, lines 16-18; Page 18, lines 4-9; FIG. 6 – 604;  Page 11, lines 3-4; Page 11, lines 20-22; Page 12, lines 1-2; Fig. 5; Fig. 6 – 602; Fig. 4C – 406B, 408B, 410B, and 412B
(d) displaying, in the computer graphics program on a display device, the one or more project drawing files in the various folders.	Page 8, lines 3-10; Fig. 1 – 102; Page 9, lines 2-3; Page 16, lines 15-23;

In view of the above, it may be noted that independent claims 1, 11, and 21 are generally directed to defining a project in a computer graphics program. More specifically, a project file is obtained that provides general information regarding a project. A directory structure is then created for the project. Project drawing files are organized into various folders of the directory structure by drawing file type. Further, the drawing files are composed of either a building information model component (for the project) or a report generated from the building information model. The organization into the various folders is further based on the model or report accordingly. A companion file for each project drawing file is obtained. Each companion file provides information used to create the directory structure that the files are organized in and also provides information to link each project drawing file to a particular project (based on the building information model or report). Lastly, the drawing files are displayed in the various folders within the graphics application.

## VII. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED

Whether claims 1-30 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bondy et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0191219 (Bondy) in view of Halpert et al., U.S. Publication No. 2004/0225958 (Halpert).

## VIII. ARGUMENT

In paragraphs (2)-(3) of the Office Action, claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bondy et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0191219 (Bondy) in view of Halpert et al., U.S. Publication No. 2004/0225958 (Halpert).

Specifically, the independent claims were rejected as follows:

As per claim 1, Bondy teaches

A computer-implemented method for defining a project in a computer graphics program comprising: (see abstract and background)

- (a) obtaining a project file in the computer graphics program comprising general information regarding the project; (project, paragraph [0018])
- (b) creating a directory structure in the computer graphics program for the project wherein: (set up directory structure, paragraph [0018])
  - (i) one or more project drawing files are organized into various folders by drawing file type of the one or more project drawing files; (stored in folders, paragraph [0019])
  - (ii) the one or more project drawing files are composed of either a building information model for the project or a report generated from the building information model; (template, paragraph [0020]) and
  - (iii) the one or more project drawing files are organized into the various folders based on the building information model or the report accordingly; (stored in repository, paragraph [0020])
- (c) obtaining a companion file for each project drawing file, wherein each companion file provides information used to create the directory structure (set up directory structure and resources stored into folders in accordance with the configuration file, paragraph [0018]-[0019]) and comprises information to link each project drawing file to the project based on the building information model or the report; (tags to identify resources, paragraph [0019]).

Bondy does not explicitly indicate “(d) displaying, in the computer graphics program on a display device, the one or more project drawing files in the various folders”.

However, Halpert discloses “(d) displaying, in the computer graphics program on a display device, the one or more project drawing files in the various folders” (viewer, paragraph [0096]; figure 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bondy and Halpert because using the steps of “(d) displaying, in the computer graphics program on a display device, the one or more project drawing files in the various folders” would have given those skilled in the art the tools give a visual representation of the project structure. This gives the user the advantage of being able to view the project structure.

As per claims 11-20,

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-10 and are similarly rejected.

As per claims 21-30,

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-10 and are similarly rejected.

A. Claims 1-30 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bondy et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0191219 (Bondy) in view of Halpert et al., U.S. Publication No. 2004/0225958 (Halpert).

1. Independent claims 1, 11, and 21

Applicant traverses the above rejections for one or more of the following reasons:

- (1) Neither Bondy nor Halpert teach, disclose or suggest a computer graphics program;
- (2) Neither Bondy nor Halpert teach, disclose or suggest a project file in a computer graphics program;
- (3) Neither Bondy nor Halpert teach, disclose or suggest a drawing in a computer graphics program;
- (4) Neither Bondy nor Halpert teach, disclose or suggest a drawing file have a drawing file type;
- (5) Neither Bondy nor Halpert teach, disclose or suggest organizing a drawing file into a folder based on a drawing file type;
- (6) Neither Bondy nor Halpert teach, disclose or suggest a building information model or a report from a building information model;
- (7) Neither Bondy nor Halpert teach, disclose or suggest organizing drawing files into a folders based on a building information model or report from a building information model;
- (8) Neither Bondy nor Halpert teach, disclose or suggest a companion file for each drawing file; and
- (9) Neither Bondy nor Halpert teach, disclose or suggest a companion file for each drawing file that provides information to both (i) create a directory structure, and (2) to link each drawing file to a project based on the building information model or report.

Independent claims 1, 11, and 21 are generally directed to defining a project in a computer graphics program. More specifically, a project file is obtained that provides general information regarding a project. A directory structure is then created for the project. Project drawing files are organized into various folders of the directory structure by drawing file type. Further, the drawing files are composed of either a building information model component (for the project) or a report generated from the building information model. The organization into the various folders is further based on the model or report accordingly. A companion file for each project drawing file is

obtained. Each companion file provides information used to create the directory structure that the files are organized in and also provides information to link each project drawing file to a particular project (based on the building information model or report). Lastly, the drawing files are displayed in the various folders within the graphics application.

The cited references do not teach nor suggest these various elements of Applicants' independent claims.

Applicants first note that the claimed invention is directed towards a computer graphics program. The preamble requires a computer graphics program and the first claim element obtains a project file in the computer graphics program. In rejecting this claim element, the Office Action relies on the abstract, background, and paragraph [0018] of Bondy. Applicants note that Bondy's abstract indicates that Bondy is directed towards printing a project of documents containing variable data and not a computer graphics program. In this regard, printing documents is not even remotely similar to a computer graphics program or drawings in a computer graphics program. Bondy's background further describes the process of printing fixed data and variable data in a "printing application". Again, a printing application is not a computer graphics program as claimed. Bondy's paragraph [0018] further describes a process for printing variable data document projects. In this regard, Bondy does not teach, describe, suggest, or remotely allude to a computer graphics program.

Applicants further note that the claims provide for project drawing files in the computer graphics program. Such claim limitations also provide that the drawing files are organized into various folders by drawing file type of the drawing files. Such limitations further provide the context of the invention in that it relates to drawings and drawing files in a computer graphics program. In addition, such drawing files are organized based on the type of drawing file. In rejecting this claim element, the Office Action refers to Bondy's "stored in folders" set forth in paragraph [0019].

Paragraph [0019] provides:

[0019] Resources for the project, such as images, fonts, and graphics, are acquired in step 204. Also, in step 204, the resources for the project are stored in folders, i.e. directories, in accordance with the configuration file and tagged with appropriate metadata tags to identify the resources and associate the resources with the proper project and documents. In step 206, test data is acquired. Test data can be any set of data corresponding to expected variable data, such as a single representative record from a database to be used for variable data. In step 208, a counter is added to the file to provide a unique sequence number to each record of the project.

As can be seen from this text, the only mention of graphics is when it is a graphic for a document project. Thus, Bondy still fails to describe a computer graphics program. Further, a

drawing file (i.e., a file containing a drawing) is not similar to a document that contains a font or graphic. Again, a drawing and computer graphics program provide a particular context that is neither hinted at or suggested in Bondy. In addition, the claimed drawing files are organized into folders by drawing file type. Nowhere in the cited text (or remainder of Bondy) is there a remote reference to organizing files (not to mention that they are drawing files) in any location based on the type of file (or type of drawing file) as claimed. Instead, Bondy describes storing resources for the project in folders based on a configuration file. In this regard, the configuration file is not a drawing file type. In addition, the claimed drawing files are stored in the folders based on their own drawing file type and not based on a separate configuration file.

The present claims continue and provide that the project drawing files are composed of either a building information model for the project or a report generated from the model. As can be seen throughout the text of the specification as filed, a building information model is an information model for a building (see paragraphs [0015]-[0017], [0038], [0040], etc.). Accordingly, the use of the term “building information model” in the claims provides a specific meaning and intent that can’t merely be ignored. Under MPEP §2142 and 2143.03 “To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).” In this regard, the term “building” that modifies “information model” as used in the claims cannot merely be disregarded. Bondy’s template has no relationship whatsoever to a building information model as claimed. Instead, Bondy provides that static portions of a print job are created as a template. Such a teaching is not even remotely similar to a building information model as claimed. The structure and use of the various folders and the drawing files in the particular folders provides functional advantages in the building industry (as further defined in the independent claims). Thus, to equate a template in a printing application with drawing files in a building information model is logically flawed.

In addition, the claims provide that the drawing files are stored/organized in the folders based on the building information model or report. In rejecting this claim element, the Office Action relies on Bondy’s repository in paragraph [0020]. However, Bondy merely describes the creation of a markup of a page layout design that is imported into a repository. Bondy then

provides that updates are stored in the repository. Such a teaching again fails to describe a claimed building information model. Further, the claimed limitations relating to the organization of drawing files into folders based on an information model is completely ignored in a mere recitation of a repository that is used for a markup of a page layout design and updates of a static portion of an image. Again, there is not even a remote similarity between Bondy's teaching and the claimed invention with respect to such specifically and explicitly claimed elements.

The present claims then provide that a companion file is created for each project drawing file. In rejecting this claim element, the Office Action relies on Bondy's configuration file. Applicants note that Bondy's configuration file stores "the file structure, ID, and other project specific data" (see paragraph [0018]). Thus, Bondy's configuration file is a single file that is used to store all document project information. Accordingly, Bondy's configuration file is not created separately for each project file as claimed. In this regard, instead of creating a companion file for each project drawing file (as claimed), Bondy creates a single configuration file that is used on a project wide basis. Such a teaching does not and cannot teach the companion files for each project drawing file as claimed.

The present claims then provide that the companion file provides information used to create the directory structure. There is no mention or even remote suggestion in Bondy for creating a directory structure based on the configuration - not to mention creating a directory structure for the companion files that are created for each project drawing file as claimed.

The present claims further provide that each companion file has information to link each project drawing file to the project based on the building information model or the report. Again, a single configuration file that merely provides a file structure, ID, and other project specific data does not and cannot possibly teach a companion file that is used to link each and every project drawing file to a project wherein such a link is based on a building information model or report as claimed.

Applicants further note that the ability to link the file based on the building information model provides the ability to manage drawing files that have different meaning in different folders. Such a functional advantage is further illustrated in claims 6-9. These claims provide a more detailed context for the building information model aspect of the claims. In this regard, the folders and respective drawing files provide for elements, constructs, views, and sheets - all of which have specific identifiable meanings as set forth in the claims. In rejecting each of these claims, the Office

Action relies on Halpert. However, Halpert is not in the building information industry and is such unrelated art that it cannot be applied to the present invention. In this regard, Halpert relates to publishing or displaying structured data at a website (see Abstract). The only mention of a project in Halpert relates to the Microsoft™ program Microsoft Project™. Thus, such a reliance in the Office Action to a project application when rejecting claims in a project having project drawing files is completely and entirely misplaced.

In response to the above arguments, the final Office Action first states that Applicants argues the preamble. Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse such an assertion. While the preamble discloses that a project is defined, the actual claim limitations explained in the above arguments serve to perform such a defining of the project. Further, the actual claim limitations provide for the computer graphics program.

The final Office Action continues on page 9 and states that the contents of the files themselves are immaterial since the data is not made functional in the claims and is just treated as any other type of data. Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse such an assertion. In this regard, the claim limitations absolutely provide functional limitations with respect to the content of the files. For example, the project drawing files are organized into folders by drawing file type of the one or more project drawing files. Thus, rather than merely organizing files into random folders, the type of drawing – i.e., drawing file types are used to organize the files into particular folders. Further, while the project drawing files are made up of either a building information model or a report from such a model, the claim limitations explicitly provide that the files are also organized into the folders based on such a model or report. Further yet, each project drawing file is linked to a project based on such a model or report. Accordingly, contrary to that asserted in the final Office Action, it is impossible to separate the claim limitations and their functional aspects relating to the both how the files are organized and how the files are linked to a project.

As stated above, Applicants reassert that nowhere in the cited text (or remainder of Bondy) is there a remote reference to organizing files (not to mention that they are drawing files) in any location based on the type of file (or type of drawing file) as claimed. Instead, Bondy describes storing resources for the project in folders based on a configuration file. In this regard, the configuration file is not a drawing file type. In addition, the claimed drawing files are stored in the folders based on their own drawing file type and not based on a separate configuration file. Instead,

paragraph [0018] are relied upon to allegedly teach a directory structure where files are organized into various folders based on file content. Paragraph [0018] provides:

[0018] FIG. 3 is a flowchart of the process for printing variable data document projects in accordance with the embodiment. The process can be divided into two distinct phases. The first phase is the creation phase (to the left of the dotted line) and the second phase is the production phase (to the right of the dotted line). Referring to FIGS. 1 and 2, each component communicates with operations management component 32 to permit operations management component 32 to maintain a real-time status of each project. For example, such communication can be in an HTTP compliant format using XML messaging in the manner described below. The process begins in step 200 in which a project is created by operations management component 32. In step 202, a file structure and directory structure for the project is set up in repository 140 in accordance with an assigned identification, such as a customer ID and a job ID. The ID is used as metadata to permit tracking and reporting of status and other variables. The file structure, ID and other project specific data can be stored as a configuration file for the project.

As can be seen from this text (and the remainder of Bondy), there is no reference nor teaching, implicit or explicit, regarding the organization of files into folders based on a file type whatsoever. Instead, a project is created and a file structure and directory structure for the project are set up in a repository. However, such a teaching does not even remotely refer to organizing files into a folder based on a file type (or more specifically a drawing file type).

The claim limitations also provide that the drawing files are composed of either a building information model or report. Further, such a model or report are used when organizing the files into folders and the companion file link the project drawing file to the model or report. No such building information model or report are even remotely alluded to in Bondy. Further, the final Office Action fails to address the arguments relating to such claim elements.

In addition, the claim limitations explicitly provide that the companion file is used to “create the directory structure”. Nowhere in Bondy, explicitly or implicitly, is there any teaching, hint, suggestion, or otherwise regarding the creation of a directory structure whatsoever. Further, the ability for a companion file to provide information that is used to create such a directory structure is completely and entirely lacking from Bondy. The final Office Action completely disregards and ignores the explicit claim limitations directed towards directory structure creation and merely glosses over the limitations stating “companion file with metadata tags to identify resources, paragraph [0019], lines 1-8.” Such a summary rejection is improper and fails to address each of the claim limitations. Accordingly, the final Office Action has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of nonobviousness.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the rejected claims.

2. Dependent claims 6, 16, and 26

Claim 6 provides that an element type of a drawing file is a set of geometry that is repeated throughout a project. In rejecting this claim element, the Office Action relies on Halpert paragraph [0084]. Paragraph [0084] does not even remotely allude to a set of geometry that is repeated in a drawing file. Instead, paragraph [0084] describes the ability to import any document that has structured data into a website. Such a teaching is not relevant whatsoever to the present claims.

Again, claims 6, 16, and 26 (in combination with claims 5, 15, and 25) are specifically directed towards the building industry and a CAD application having elements, constructs, views, and sheets. Such claim limitations are not even remotely alluded to in any of the cited references. In this regard, the reliance on both Bondy and Halpert is totally misplaced and illogical.

In responding to such arguments, the final Office Action asserts that Halpert discloses that a structure can be imported into a matching structure (paragraph [0084]). However, paragraph [0084] does not even mention geometry nor geometry that can be repeated in a project. Further, since the claims disclose a project in a computer graphics application, the ability to repeat a set of geometry in such a project clearly has functional aspects. By ignoring the computer graphics and project aspects of the claims, the final Office Action is disregarding the limitations that present useful and functional material.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of these dependent claims.

3. Dependent claims 7, 17, and 27

Claim 7 further provides that the construct type drawing file is an identification of geometry and data for a particular level/wing and category of the project and one or more elements. Again, the level/wing aspect of the claims specifically relates to the building industry. In rejecting this claim, the Office Action relies on Bondy paragraph [0030] which states that a component tag is a descriptor identifying a type of information being sent. Applicants do not understand the relevance of such a recitation to the present claims. Such a statement does not disclose geometry, a level/wing, a category of a project, or elements, as claimed.

Again, claims 7, 17, and 27 (in combination with claims 5, 15, and 25) are specifically directed towards the building industry and a CAD application having elements, constructs, views,

and sheets. Such claim limitations are not even remotely alluded to in any of the cited references. In this regard, the reliance on both Bondy and Halpert is totally misplaced and illogical.

In response to such arguments, the final Office Action asserts that the claim limitations are non-functional and descriptive and therefore no need exists to separately address these claim limitations beyond that of the rejections of independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse such an assertion. All of the claim limitations provide various functional limitations in that it specifies the types of files that can be organized into particular folders and how to organize such files. Further, viewed in conjunction with the independent claims, the limitations explain and provide functional capabilities that are used by and in the independent claims. For example, the claim limitations in claims 7, 17, and 27 provide that the companion file provides information used to create a directory structure that contains a constructs folder and further provides that a construct type drawing file is stored in such a folder. Further, the construct file identifies geometry and data for a particular level/wing and category of the project along with one or more elements. Such specific claim limitations go well beyond providing mere descriptive non-functional material.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of these dependent claims.

#### 4. Dependent claims 8, 18, and 28

Claim 8 provides that the view type drawing file automatically assembles constructs to represent a portion of a project that has been selected based upon user specified data. In rejecting this claim, the Office Action relies on Halpert paragraph [0092]. This paragraph describes the steps that occur when a file is dropped onto an Inbox. Again, the relevance of such a description with respect to the present claims is unknown.

Again, claims 8, 18, and 28 (in combination with claims 5, 15, and 25) are specifically directed towards the building industry and a CAD application having elements, constructs, views, and sheets. Such claim limitations are not even remotely alluded to in any of the cited references. In this regard, the reliance on both Bondy and Halpert is totally misplaced and illogical.

In response to these prior arguments, the final Office Action asserts that the claim can be interpreted as directed towards most any type of data and therefore Halpert discloses the limitation. Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse such an assertion. In this regard, the claims

provide a functional limitation in that the view type drawing file functionally and automatically assembles appropriate constructs to represent a portion of a project that has been selected based upon user specified data. There is not even a remote possibility that such claim language merely depicts non-functional descriptive material. Not only is a portion of a project selected based upon user specified data, but the view type drawing file automatically assembles appropriate constructs to represent such a portion. Thus, there are two separate functional aspects in these claims. Nowhere in paragraph [0092] nor the remainder of Halpert is there a capability to select a portion of a project based on user specified data. In this regard, what occurs when a file is dropped onto an Inbox does not remotely reflect either the selection of a portion of a project nor a selection based upon user specified data. In fact, such a description does not suggest the selection of a portion of anything.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of these claims.

##### 5. Dependent claims 9, 19, and 29

Claim 9 provides that the sheet type drawing file has one or more views and represents a printed/plotted document. In rejecting these claims, the Office Action relies on Bondy paragraph [0039] which describes the formatting of personalized catalogs for printing. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Bondy relating to views for a drawing sheet as claimed.

Again, claims 9, 19, and 29 (in combination with claims 5, 15, and 25) are specifically directed towards the building industry and a CAD application having elements, constructs, views, and sheets. Such claim limitations are not even remotely alluded to in any of the cited references. In this regard, the reliance on both Bondy and Halpert is totally misplaced and illogical.

The final Office Action fails to address the arguments above. Accordingly, Applicants assume that the Examiner has acquiesced and agrees with the above arguments. Thus, Appilcants respectfully request allowance of these claims.

#### IX. CONCLUSION

Moreover, the various elements of Applicants' claimed invention together provide operational advantages over Bondy and Halpert. In addition, Applicants' invention solves problems not recognized by Bondy and Halpert.

Thus, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 11 and 21 are allowable over Bondy and Halpert. Further, dependent claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22-30 are submitted to be allowable over Bondy and Halpert in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 11 and 21, respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22-30 recite additional novel elements not shown by Bondy and Halpert.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul J. McArdle et al.

By their attorneys,

GATES & COOPER LLP

Howard Hughes Center  
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050  
Los Angeles, California 90045  
(310) 641-8797

Date: October 22, 2007

By:Jason S. Feldmar/

Name: Jason S. Feldmar  
Reg. No.: 39,187

JSF/sjm/kmk